Wisconsin Center for Education Research
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

WEC Supporting PreK-12

Wisconsin
Evaluation
Collaborative

Partners for Afterschool Success (PASS) AmeriCorps
Program Evaluation – Final Report

October 2016

Annalee Good, Ph.D.
Grant Sim, M.P.A.

Wisconsin Evaluation Collaborative
Wisconsin Center for Education Research
1025 West Johnson St
Madison, WI 53706
annalee.good@wisc.edu

Partners for After School Success (PASS) AmeriCorps

Final Evaluation Summary – October 2016

Evaluation Design

Alignment • Implementation
Impact • Satisfaction

Qualitative

Focus groups, interviews, site visits, document analysis

Quantitative

Descriptive and quasi-experimental analysis of student data and program surveys

Formative feedback

Towards program improvement

The Program

The Partners for After School Success (PASS) AmeriCorps program provides three core activities to 6-12 grade school students including in-school literacy tutoring services; extended learning programs to build social-emotional skills; and opportunities for youth to engage in volunteer activities. PASS is a multisite AmeriCorps program run by Dane County Human Services in partnership with 13 community-based agencies.

Findings

- The PASS tutoring and ELP models are *aligned to research-based and community-defined best practices*

- Despite varied conditions on the site level, *implementation is consistent to the overall model*

- PASS tutoring and ELP provide valuable support to students' engagement with learning through *providing developmental relationships with themselves as learners and adults who care about their social, emotional, and intellectual growth*, as evidenced by consistent positive responses from stakeholders, positive outcomes for literacy growth, and consistent positive impact of PASS ELP on school attendance

Recommendations

- Continue to monitor changes to metrics for tutoring (to SRI) and ELP (to smart goals) to ensure *metrics are appropriate to the intended outcomes and contexts* in which they are being used
- *Continue evaluating the impact* of PASS ELP on school attendance, and explore additional areas of PASS programming to determine feasibility of quasi-experimental design in estimating impact
- *Continue to revise training* of AmeriCorps members to focus on student engagement with learning as a primary outcome, which in turn supports academic achievement
- As the PASS program has drawn on culturally responsive practices in training with AmeriCorps members, consider explicitly *applying culturally responsive frameworks to future evaluation* plans as well

Contents

Background and purpose

The Partners for After School Success (PASS) AmeriCorps program provides three core activities to 6-12 grade school students including in-school literacy tutoring services; extended learning programs to build social-emotional skills; and opportunities for youth to engage in volunteer activities. PASS is a multisite AmeriCorps program run by Dane County Human Services in partnership with 13 community-based agencies. The PASS literacy tutoring model emphasizes building supportive relationships between tutors and students to encourage student engagement within schools and academic achievement. Members receives 15 hour of training in literacy strategies to develop supportive tutoring relationships while building reading skills and over 100 hours of training in relevant youth issues. Members actively coordinate tutoring efforts with reading teachers and school staff. The PASS program model requires members to tutor at least 15 sessions a year for each student. The PASS ELP program matches AmeriCorps members with after school sites, where they direct and coordinate enrichment and academic support activities with youth, focused on the non-cognitive or engagement factors critical to student learning.

PASS engaged the Wisconsin Evaluation Collaborative (WEC) at Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER), housed at the University of Wisconsin-Madison to design and conduct an external evaluation of both the PASS tutoring and ELP programs. The evaluation was both formative and summative, and focused on the process of program implementation, its outcomes, and estimation of impact on available indicators. The overall purpose of this evaluation was to provide accessible, rigorous and relevant assessment of program performance towards the ultimate goal of program improvement and progress along the evidence continuum. Specifically, we examined the alignment, implementation, outcomes, impact, and level of satisfaction of the PASS program, guided by the following questions:
- Is PASS aligned to research-based practices and the goals of partner districts?
- Is implementation consistent with the intended program model and target population?
- What are program attendance trends and the impact of the extended learning and tutoring programs on students' academic achievement and school engagement?

Evaluation methods
Overall design
This mixed-method process, outcome and impact evaluation of PASS integrates qualitative fieldwork (focus groups, interviews, site visits, survey text, and document analysis) with quantitative analysis of surveys, and descriptive and quasi-experimental analysis of student level data from the PASS program and its largest partner district, Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD). Based on previous findings specific to measures of school engagement in PASS Extended Learning Program (ELP), we also conducted a formative evaluation of implementation fidelity in 2015. Through additional

site visits, interviews, surveys, and document analysis, we examined the extent to which community sites were implementing the core activities and foci laid out in the PASS ELP logic model.

Data collection process
The types, sources and samples of data used in the evaluation of program implementation, outcomes and impact would include, but are not limited to:

- Lists of students participating in PASS, with attendance (dosage) levels from the PASS program database. The sample includes all students receiving the target dosage in PASS programs (tutoring = 15 sessions; ELP = 30 sessions) in 2014-15 and 2015-2016.
- Demographic data (e.g. eligibility for free and reduced lunch, race and ethnicity, gender, language status, or special education status) for students participating in PASS programs from school district databases. The sample includes all students receiving the target dosage in PASS programs (tutoring = 15 sessions; ELP = 30 sessions) in 2014-15 and 2015-2016.
- Student attendance and scores on district-administered standardized assessments including MAP or ACT. The sample includes all students receiving the target dosage in PASS programs (tutoring = 15 sessions; ELP = 30 sessions) in 2014-15 and, as well as those PASS and non-PASS students identified as matches for a comparison group for the impact analysis of ELP on attendance. Student attendance data for PASS and non-PASS groups also were analyzed for 2012-13 and 2013-14.
- Student scores on the PASS-administered pre and post assessment of literacy Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) in tutoring and social emotional learning School Engagement Survey (SES) in ELP. The sample includes all students receiving the target dosage in PASS programs (tutoring = 15 sessions; ELP = 30 sessions) in 2014-15 and 2015-2016.
- Survey data of program site directors collected by the PASS (2014-16)
- Survey data collected by a partner district (MMSD) in 2015-16, where respondents included school-level staff (2015 and 2016), as well as students (2016). The staff survey was deployed electronically to all staff in schools where PASS tutoring was located. The student survey was given by paper to all students receiving at least 15 tutoring sessions in the year.
- Focus group data from AmeriCorps members and interview data with PASS program staff.
- Text from Quarter 1 of 2015 reports was used to study implementation of the ELP model.

WEC and PASS secured data sharing agreements with district research and evaluation departments, and established a process for linking PASS program data with district data in a way that maintains the privacy and security of student-level data in compliance with state and federal law.

Analytic approach

Quantitative data analysis: Quantitative student-level data first was analyzed descriptively for the outcomes described above, and disaggregated by student demographics when possible (e.g. eligibility for free and reduced meals, race and ethnicity, gender, language status, and disability status). The additional analysis of comparative impact used Propensity Score Matching (PSM) to identify demographically similar peers to the PASS students. PSM identified a comparison group by first calculating the probability of PASS participation based on particular demographic characteristics (e.g. race, income status, language status or special education eligibility, etc.) and performance on pre-test measures, and attached a "propensity score" to students based on those characteristics. Then, PASS students were matched with students in the district with similar propensity scores, but who did not participate in PASS programs. Gains in outcome indicators for PASS students, in this case school attendance and test scores, were compared to gains for the matched, non-PASS students. This process helps to "control" for other possible variables on school attendance. Survey data was analyzed descriptively, reporting on aggregate responses for school level staff, and students.

Qualitative data analysis: Qualitative data sources such as focus groups and narrative survey responses were analyzed using a set of codes developed in alignment to the research questions described above. The coding scheme was applied to the qualitative data via Excel in order to determine patterns in responses, which then were developed into analytic themes. Finally, analytic themes in the qualitative data were then triangulated with patterns in the quantitative data to produce more comprehensive and coherent findings, and ultimately recommendations for program improvement.

As a mixed-method evaluation, quantitative and qualitative data was analyzed in conjunction with one another to provide triangulated and integrated findings. This offered a more complete and nuanced assessment of program implementation, outcomes, and impact. WEC provided constant, formative feedback on all components of the evaluation throughout the three years, which has led to important improvements in program design. These changes and further recommendations are described later in this report.

Limitations

This evaluation is limited in two, primary ways. First, additional qualitative data collection would have been possible with a broader scope, including more site visits. This would have allowed for a more nuanced picture of implementation at the specific site level. Second, we were not able to conduct a quasi-experimental estimate of impact for the PASS tutoring program due to small sample sizes at the school site level.

Results

The following section details findings of the process, outcome and impact evaluation of PASS. Overall, these findings suggests:
1. The PASS tutoring and ELP models are aligned to research-based best practices
2. Despite varied conditions on the site level, implementation is consistent to the overall model
3. Drawing on frameworks established by the Consortium for Chicago School Research, the primary value of PASS is towards engagement, or the "noncognitive" or "social emotional" factors that are critical for academic growth.[1] PASS tutoring and ELP provide valuable support to students' academic and social-emotional learning through *providing developmental relationships with themselves as learners and adults who care about their learning*, as evidenced by consistent positive responses from stakeholders, positive outcomes for literacy growth, and consistent positive impact of PASS ELP on school attendance.

Findings of process evaluation of alignment and implementation

Alignment:
- PASS is aligned to the research base on academic tutoring (see Appendix E) and out of school time programming in that it is structured, led by members who receive quality and relevant training throughout the year, tutoring matches are kept small (i.e. 1:1), the content of tutoring and ELP are aligned to the partner school districts, and the population of students served are on the cusp of proficiency or at risk of failure.
- PASS is aligned to the goals of partner districts and organizations. For example, PASS took part in the development and alignment process of the MMSD Academic Tutoring Best Practices Framework in 2015, and continues to be an active member of the Tutor Network community of practice.

Implementation:
- Descriptive analysis of student level data show tutoring serves the intended student population. For example, in the 2015-16 school year:
  - 91% of students in PASS middle school tutoring and 75% in PASS middle school ELP were eligible for free and reduced lunch
  - 91% in PASS middle school tutoring were students of color, and 78% in PASS middle school ELP
  - On average students in PASS scored lower on MAP scores than the district average
- Middle school youth engaged in the tutoring program receive an average of 29 tutoring sessions hours of programming over the course of the year, and those in ELP receive an average of 123 hours of programming in a year.

---

[1] Available from: https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Wallace%20Report.pdf

- Member training is comprehensive, sustained and relevant to program needs
- SES scores were lower than projected in the PASS ELP program. Therefore, a fidelity study of ELP was conducted in the winter and spring of 2015 to determine if a) the PASS ELP model was being implemented with fidelity and b) if the current metric (SES) for student outcomes needed revision. Evaluators triangulated data from surveys of ELP site directors, text from Quarter 1 reports for each site, site visits, and interviews. We took the core activities described in the PASS logic model and coded each data source for that activity (see example below of "Second Step"). Our analysis suggests the core elements of the model are being implemented consistently across sites, but current measures of school engagement needed refinement. This led to the changes in ELP metric described in the discussion section.

Example of "core activities" analysis in fidelity study of ELP (see Appendix A for full table)

CORE ELP ACTIVITY	Frequency: Offered at site 1+ per week	Frequency: Led by AC Member 1+ per week	Frequency: Never offered at the site	Skill focus	Q1 2015 coding summary
Second Step	24/60 (40%)	18/58 (31%)	12/60 (20%)	Social/emotional (36/47 or 77%); Life skills (6/47 or 13%)	4 sites mentioned Second Step programming during the day in homeroom, one site on Wednesdays, one site to continue through the summer, and one described as one week every other month.; Many sites (11) plan to do second step in Q2.; Many sites (8) currently incorporate second step into various clubs but not using the structured 2nd step curriculum.

- The following is a summary of patterns in qualitative data related to the tutoring model and implementation, as collected via site visits and focus groups with tutors and/or tutoring coordinators.
    - Stakeholders have a clear sense of the PASS program delivery model. There is also a clear definition of what counts and does not count as a tutoring session.
    - Program model of AmeriCorps members being the tutor allows for tutors to be available when teachers put in requests as well as they check on students during lunch and after school.
    - Frequent frustration between school (school staff) and PASS members around communication, echoed by an expressed need for improved support from school administration.
    - Stakeholders felt training for PASS tutors was very strong. Weekly trainings for PASS were seen as positive training experience for tutors, as well as opportunities to relieve stress and network.

Findings of evaluation of outcomes and impact

Stakeholder perception of outcomes and impact:
- The majority of adult stakeholders (teachers, administrators, program staff and tutors) perceive tutoring and ELP as having a positive impact on both academic achievement and school engagement. The following is a summary of patterns in qualitative data related to perceived impact of the program by stakeholders, as collected via site visits and focus groups with tutors and/or tutoring coordinators.
    - Stakeholders believe there is a positive impact on students' behavioral and social/emotional growth and school engagement. In particular, there is a positive impact on building relationships with adults.
    - Focus groups and conversations during site visits reflect a positive impact on academic achievement in relation to assignment completion.
    - When asked about the specific needs served by PASS at their school, teachers focused on the support provided in engaging students in learning, "Kids need a one on one [tutor] to keep them on task and engaged".
- The following is a summary of responses on district-wide survey in MMSD specific to PASS tutoring [see Appendix D for more detail]:
    - The majority of school staff (instructional and administrative) feel PASS:
        - is aligned to the goals of the district (only asked on 2015 survey)
        - is aligned to best practices in academic tutoring (only asked on 2016 survey)
        - makes a positive impact on student learning and engagement
    - The majority of students surveyed report PASS tutoring has a positive impact on their engagement and learning

Analysis of student level data:
- Quasi-experimental comparative analyses of student level data suggest ELP has a statistically significant positive effect on school attendance rates for students attending at least 30 sessions over the last four years, with this observed effect becoming more pronounced over time. A summary of effect on attendance rate is below (bold indicates statistically significant effect at least at the 90% confidence level), but see Appendix C for more detail on this analysis:

Estimate of effect of 30+ sessions of PASS ELP on school attendance rate

	Grade	Difference in attendance rate
2012-13	6th	0.585
	7th	0.697
	8th	**2.337**
2013-14	6th	0.204
	7th	0.399
	8th	**1.625**
2014-15	6th	0.221
	7th	**1.736**
	8th	**1.629**
2015-16	6th	**1.30**
	7th	**2.57**
	8th	**2.22**

- Comparative analysis on district-administered standardized tests (MAP) did not detect an impact of PASS ELP (see Appendix C). We believe this is a result of the measure not detecting an impact, as opposed to the program not having an impact on student learning.
- Although quasi-experimental comparative analysis was not possible for PASS tutoring due to sample sizes, descriptive analysis of score on the pre and post assessments of reading showed positive growth
  - QRI (Qualitative Reading Inventory), administered by tutors to only those students receiving PASS tutoring showed an average growth of 1.9 points in 2014-15 from Fall to Spring
  - The SRI is administered to all students in READ 180 reading intervention classes by MMSD instructional staff. PASS students showed average growth of 146 points from Fall to Spring (compared to district average of 133)

Discussion and recommendations

Constant process of program improvement towards a stronger evidence base

This evaluation suggests the PASS program has a positive influence on students' engagement with their own learning through developmental relationships with adults who care about their social, emotional, and intellectual growth. The evaluation process was truly formative, with evaluators providing regular feedback to program staff, who in turn either made program changes or asked for deeper examination of particular elements of the program. The PASS program has gone through a "looping" process of continuous program improvement over the course of the evaluation, with the goal of moving along the continuum from an evidence-informed model, to developing its own evidence base of positive outcomes and impacts. There are a number of specific examples of this feedback loop in practice over the last three years:

- As a result of the study in 2015 of ELP fidelity and implementation, it was determined that the negative findings in previous School Engagement Survey responses signaled a need to refine the measure, not the model. In other words, the PASS model continued to focus on the social, emotional, and academic needs of youth with the goal of improving school engagement through skill development Evaluators provided guidance in the process of refining both the performance measure and associated instrumentation.
- Training modules were redesigned in 2016 to increase the focus on various non-cognitive or engagement strategies (e.g. goal setting, growth mindset)
- As a result of feedback from AmeriCorps members, as well as district partners, PASS decided in 2016 to shift its metric of literacy growth in tutoring from QRI to existing district assessments of literacy. This change led to several improvements, including better alignment with existing district assessments, greater possibility of impact study of tutoring, more time available for tutoring (versus administering the pre and post test), and more time during member training for other topics

This purposeful, systematic process of using formative evaluation towards continuous program improvement is key to the ability of PASS to move along the evidence continuum and demonstrate positive outcomes and impact.

Recommendations

Based on the evaluation process and findings described above, we make the following recommendations for further program improvement:
- Continue to monitor changes to metrics for tutoring (to SRI) and ELP (to smart goals) to ensure metrics are appropriate to the intended outcomes and contexts in which they are being used
- Continue evaluating the impact of PASS ELP on school attendance, and explore additional areas of PASS programming to determine feasibility of quasi-experimental design in estimating impact
- Continue to revise training of AmeriCorps members to focus on student engagement with learning as a primary outcome, which in turn supports academic achievement
- As the PASS program has drawn on culturally responsive practices in training with AmeriCorps members, consider explicitly applying culturally responsive frameworks to future evaluation plans as well

Appendix

Appendix A: 2015 Fidelity Study – Core Activity Profiles

CORE ELP ACTIVITY	Frequency: Offered at site 1+ per week	Frequency: Led by AC Member 1+ per week	Frequency: Never offered at the site	Skill focus: Primary	Skill focus: Secondary	Q1 2015 coding summary
Second Step	24/60 (40%)	18/58 (31%)	12/60 (20%)	Social/emotional (36/47 or 77%); Life skills (6/47 or 13%)	Life skills (25/43 or 58%); Social/emotional (9/43 or 21%)	Second Step: 4 sites mentioned Second Step programming during the day in homeroom, one site on Wednesdays, one site to continue through the summer, and one described as one week every other month.; Many sites (11) plan to do second step in Q2.; Many sites (8) currently incorporate second step into various clubs but not using the structured 2nd step curriculum.
Art/creative expression	37/60 (61%)	22/56 (39%)	8/20 (40%)	Social/Emotional (20/47 or 42%); Cognitive (17/47 or 36%)	Life skills (16/41 or 39%); Cognitive (11/41 or 26%)	One site mentioned mini art courses being popular with the students.;Two sites mentioned incorporating art projects.
Team sports	41/60 (68%)	32/56 (57%)	13/60 (21%)	Health and Fitness (34/47 or 72%); Social/emotional (7/47 or 14%)	Social/emotional (17/45 or 37%); Life skills (14/45 or 31%)	Fitness activities mentioned include: basketball (3 sites yoga, open gym, dance (2 sites outdoor sports; Three sites mentioned teaching teamwork and good sportsmanship through activities; One site mentioned the need for more special needs support with fitness.

Active recreation	47/60 (78%)	39/56 (70%)	9/60 (15%)	Health and Fitness (37/49 or 76%); Social/emotional (9/49 or 18%)	Health and Fitness (37/49 or 76%); Social/emotional 9/49 or 18%)	A few sites (3) described field trips as a good way to connect with students; Rec activities included sailing, professional basketball game, skiing, waterpark, arboretum.; Fitness activities mentioned include: basketball (3 sites yoga, open gym, dance (2 sites outdoor sports; Three sites mentioned teaching teamwork and good sportsmanship through activities; One site mentioned the need for more special needs support with fitness.
Career/work skills	14/59 (23%)	8/53 (15%)	20/59 (33%)	Life skills (30/41 or 73%); Cognitive (4/41 or 9%)	Cognitive (15/40 or 38%); Social/emotional and Life skills (6/40 or 15%)	One site mentioed a mock interview activity, one site had career professionals talking to students about career goals, and one site mentioned developing public speaking skill through community service activity.
Teen discussion groups	32/60 (53%)	27/55 (49%)	9/60 (15%)	Social/emotional (33/50 or 66%); Cognitive (11/50 or 22%)	Life skills (23/46 or 50%); Social/emotional (14/46 or 30%)	4 sites described programs such as GNP, Girls Inc, Crafts, and Reading as a safe place for students to discuss issues such family, self esteem and other social development concerns,
Leadership	31/58 (53%)	27/56 (48%)	5/58 (9%)	Life skills (35/52 or 67%); Social/emotional (10/52 or 19%)	Cognitive (23/51 or 45%); Social/emotional (21/51 41%)	3 sites described after school and after school activities such as service projects and Thanksgiving celebration as a place that allow students a place to be leaders.; Two sites discussed youth leadership club as a natural fit for second step programming.; One staff member described her expereience as a leadership growth opportunity.
Community service	14/60 (23%)	14/57 (25%)	5/60 (8%)	Social/emotional (30/55 or 54%); Life skills (19/55 or 35%)	Life skills (23/49 or 47%); Social Emotional (17/49 or 35%)	Most sites (18) described community service events as a success, which involved hands-on activities, bonding between students, relationship building between the school and community, fun experience.; A couple sites stated an incentive program (ice cream and bike raffle) help promote involvement.; A few sites (3) described low involvement in community service--one is due to isolated location and no transportation.

Homework club	53/60 (88%)	50/57 (88%)	7/60 (12%)	Homework skills (46/51 or 90%); Reading/Literacy (2/51 or 4%)	Reading/Literacy (22/49 or 45%); Cognitive (9/49 or 18%)	2 sites offer alternative activities to homework during homework club.; Described as a place to relax and catchup on homework.; 2 sites mentioned volunteers being an important support in homework club.
Any other enrichment activity	22/34 (65%)	16/30 (53%)	7/34 (21%)	Life skills (7/27 or 26%); Social/emotional and STEM (6/27 or 22%)	Cognitive (6/24 or 25%); Health and Fitness (5/24 or 21%)	STEM: 6 sites described STEM activities (cooking, science experiments, math tools) that are successful with students because they are fun. *Reading: 7 sites discussed students attitudes changing toward a love and enjoyment of reading reading; 2 sites observed that reading lead to social development discussions in small groups.

Appendix B: PASS AmeriCorps Member Focus Group

Format of focus group
- Your participation is totally voluntary. Nothing you say will be connected to your name or any identifiable information in evaluation reports. Please respect each others' confidentiality and not share specific comments made outside of this group.
- This focus group is a structured, but informal conversation about your experiences tutoring for the [name of tutoring program]. We have a list of guiding questions or topics, but there may be other, related topics that come up.
- Please do not feel like you need to raise hands to speak, but also be aware that there are many here who may want a chance to talk. If you do not get the chance to speak, please feel free to email responses to either myself or Annalee Good.
- With your consent, we would like to audio record the focus group to help us accurately represent what you all say. There will not be a transcript made of the recording and it will be destroyed after we write up the summary report.
- We expect this focus group to last about 45 minutes. Are there any questions at this time?

Time: _____
Preparation for program position
    -Orientation/initial training sessions
    -Resources/support provided throughout the year

Time: _____
Structure and organization of the program itself
    -Project structure at the program level
    -Project structure at the school and local site level

Time: _____
Impact on student growth
    -Academic
    -Social/emotional
    -School engagement

Time: _____
Greatest challenge to implementing the program the way you would like

Time: _____
Additional comments or thoughts

Appendix C: MMSD student-level quantitative data tables

PASS Tutoring (2014-15)

Middle School

Average Sessions

	2014-15
Sessions	28.6

Special Education status

	PASS Only		District Comparison 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	42.1%	57.9%	16.1%	83.9%

ELL status

	PASS Only		District Comparison 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	26.3%	73.7%	25.0%	75.0%

Eligibility status for free and reduced meals

	PASS Only		District Comparison 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	88.8%	11.2%	49.7%	50.3%

Gender and race

	PASS Only	District Comparison 6-8
	% in 2014-15	% in 2014-15
Hispanic/ Latino	18.4%	20.3%
White	5.9%	44.1%
African American	60.5%	18.3%
Asian	4.6%	8.5%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	2.0%	0.4%
Multiracial	8.6%	8.4%
Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%
Female	42.8%	48.0%
Male	57.2%	52.0%
Total students	152	5149

Average Attendance, discipline events, and academic achievement

	PASS Only	District Comparison 6-8
	2014-15	2014-15
Attendance Rate	93.0%	94.2%
Discipline events	6.6	2.1
MAP Mathematics 6th Grade Fall	200	216
MAP Mathematics 6th Grade Spring	206	224
MAP Mathematics 7th Grade Fall	203	223
MAP Mathematics 7th Grade Spring	209	229
MAP Mathematics 8th Grade Fall	206	231
MAP Mathematics 8th Grade Spring	213	236
MAP Reading 6th Grade Fall	192	210
MAP Reading 6th Grade Spring	197	216
MAP Reading 7th Grade Fall	196	216
MAP Reading 7th Grade Spring	203	219
MAP Reading 8th Grade Fall	198	222
MAP Reading 8th Grade Spring	196	224
Cumulative GPA	2.3	3.0
QRI Pre-Test	4.6	N/A
QRI Post-Test	6.1	N/A

High School

Average Sessions

	2014-15
Sessions	19.6

Special Education status

	PASS Only		District Comparison 9-12	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	40.0%	60.0%	18.5%	81.5%

ELL status

	PASS Only		District Comparison 9-12	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	25.7%	74.3%	22.2%	77.8%

Eligibility status for free and reduced meals

	PASS Only		District Comparison 9-12	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	80.0%	20.0%	42.5%	57.5%

Gender and race

	PASS Only	District Comparison 9-12
	% in 2014-15	% in 2014-15
Hispanic/ Latino	28.6%	16.2%
White	22.9%	47.5%
African American	37.1%	18.4%
Asian	5.7%	9.5%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	0.0%	0.3%
Multiracial	5.7%	8.0%
Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.1%
Female	48.6%	48.2%
Male	51.4%	51.8%
Total students	35	7100

Average Attendance, discipline events, and academic achievement

	PASS Only	District Comparison 9-12
	2014-15	2014-15
Attendance Rate	92.9%	92.6%
Discipline events	1.7	0.7
Aspire Composite 9th Grade	417	426
Aspire Composite 10th Grade	418	428
Cumulative GPA	2.2	2.8
QRI Pre-Test	6.7	N/A
QRI Post-Test	8.6	N/A

PASS Tutoring (2015-16)

Average Sessions for PASS (tutoring) 6-8

	2015-2016
Sessions	27.7

Average Sessions for PASS (tutoring) 9-10

	2015-2016
Sessions	15.6

Special Education status for (tutoring) PASS 6-8

	PASS Only - all dosage levels		District Average 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	36.0%	64.0%	16.1%	83.9%

Special Education status for (tutoring) PASS 9-10

	PASS Only - all dosage levels		District Average 9-10	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	10.0%	90.0%	15.0%	85.0%

ELL status for PASS (tutoring) 6-8

	PASS Only - all dosage levels		District Average 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	37.9%	62.1%	24.6%	75.4%

ELL status for PASS (tutoring) 9-10

	PASS Only - all dosage levels		District Average 9-10	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	20.0%	80.0%	24.5%	75.6%

Eligibility status for free and reduced meals for PASS (tutoring) 6-8

	PASS Only - all dosage levels		District Average 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	91.3%	8.7%	49.1%	50.9%

Eligibility status for free and reduced meals for PASS (tutoring) 9-10

	PASS Only - all dosage levels		District Average 9-10	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	75.0%	25.0%	45.0%	55.0%

Gender and race for PASS (tutoring) 6-8

	PASS Only - all dosage levels	District Average 6-8
	% in 2015-16	% in 2015-16
Hispanic/ Latino	28.6%	21.4%
White	8.7%	43.3%
African American	44.7%	18.2%
Asian	8.7%	8.2%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	1.9%	0.4%
Multiracial	7.5%	8.5%
Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.1%
Female	46.0%	47.6%
Male	54.0%	52.4%
Total students	161	5170

Gender and race for PASS (tutoring) 9-10

	PASS Only - all dosage levels	District Average 9-10
	% in 2015-16	% in 2015-16
Hispanic/ Latino	25.0%	18.0%
White	20.0%	46.7%
African American	40.0%	17.2%

Asian	0.0%	10.0%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	0.0%	0.3%
Multiracial	15.0%	7.9%
Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	0.0%	<0.1%
Female	45.0%	48.4%
Male	55.0%	51.7%
Total students	20	3644

Average Attendance, discipline events, and academic achievement for PASS (tutoring) 6-8

	PASS Only - all dosage levels	District Average 6-8
	2015-16	2015-16
Attendance Rate	93.6%	94.5%
Discipline events	6.4	3.9
MAP Reading 6th Grade Fall	194	212
MAP Reading 6th Grade Spring	199	216
MAP Reading 7th Grade Fall	197	217
MAP Reading 7th Grade Spring	203	220
MAP Reading 8th Grade Fall	201	221
MAP Reading 8th Grade Spring	205	224
MAP Math 6th Grade Fall	200	217
MAP Math 6th Grade Spring	205	224
MAP Math 7th Grade Fall	205	224
MAP Math 7th Grade Spring	210	230
MAP Math 8th Grade Fall	207	230
MAP Math 8th Grade Spring	211	234
Cumulative GPA	2.3	3.0
SRI Fall	536	534
SRI Spring	657	636
SRI Growth	146	133

Average Attendance, discipline events, academic achievement for PASS (tutoring) 9-10

	PASS Only - all dosage levels	District Average 9-10
	2015-16	2015-16
Attendance Rate	92.5%	93.3%
Discipline events	2.1	1.4
Aspire Composite 9th Grade	418	426
Aspire Composite 10th Grade	n/a	428
Cumulative GPA	1.7	2.8

Note: n/a indicates too few students.

PASS ELP (2014-15)

Middle School

Average Days

	2014-15
Days	49.0

Special Education status

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	17.9%	92.1%	16.1%	83.9%

ELL status

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	31.0%	69.0%	25.0%	75.0%

Eligibility status for free and reduced meals

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	72.3%	27.7%	49.7%	50.3%

Gender and race

	PASS ELP Only	District Comparison 6-8
	% in 2014-15	% in 2014-15
Hispanic/ Latino	25.3%	20.3%
White	24.9%	44.1%
African American	33.1%	18.3%
Asian	6.8%	8.5%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	0.4%	0.4%
Multiracial	9.5%	8.4%
Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%
Female	49.9%	48.0%

Male	50.1%	52.0%
Total students	1150	5149

Average Attendance, discipline events, and academic achievement

	PASS ELP Only	District Comparison 6-8
	2014-15	2014-15
Attendance Rate	94.4%	94.2%
Discipline events	3.4	2.1
MAP Mathematics 6th Grade Fall	211	216
MAP Mathematics 6th Grade Spring	219	224
MAP Mathematics 7th Grade Fall	216	223
MAP Mathematics 7th Grade Spring	222	229
MAP Mathematics 8th Grade Fall	226	231
MAP Mathematics 8th Grade Spring	231	236
MAP Reading 6th Grade Fall	206	210
MAP Reading 6th Grade Spring	212	216
MAP Reading 7th Grade Fall	210	216
MAP Reading 7th Grade Spring	214	219
MAP Reading 8th Grade Fall	217	222
MAP Reading 8th Grade Spring	219	224
Cumulative GPA	2.8	3.0

Comparative Impact on MAP *Mathematics* Score Growth

Year	Grade	Estimate (Std. Err.)
2015	Sixth	**1.497 (0.888)***
	Seventh	0.518 (1.113)
	Eighth	0.335 (0.932)

Note: Bold indicates statistically significant findings with * at the 90% level (p=0.1) and ** at the 95% level (p=0.05)

Comparative Impact on MAP *Reading* Score Growth

Year	Grade	Estimate (Std. Err.)
2015	Sixth	-1.511 (1.165)
	Seventh	0.039 (0.973)
	Eighth	-1.032 (1.235)

Note: Bold indicates statistically significant findings with * at the 90% level (p=0.1) and ** at the 95% level (p=0.05)

Comparative Impact on Attendance Rate

Year	Grade	Estimate (Std. Err.)
2015	Sixth	0.221 (0.628)
	Seventh	**1.736 (0.849)****
	Eighth	**1.629 (0.743)****

Note: Bold indicates statistically significant findings with * at the 90% level (p=0.1) and ** at the 95% level (p=0.05)

High School

Average Days

	2014-15
Days	34.1

Special Education status

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 9-12	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	28.1%	71.9%	18.5%	81.5%

ELL status

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 9-12	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	21.8%	78.2%	22.2%	77.8%

Eligibility status for free and reduced meals

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 9-12	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2014-2015	77.9%	22.1%	42.5%	57.5%

Gender and race

	PASS ELP Only	District Comparison 9-12
	% in 2014-15	% in 2014-15
Hispanic/ Latino	17.5%	16.2%
White	15.2%	47.5%
African American	53.3%	18.4%
Asian	2.3%	9.5%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	0.3%	0.3%
Multiracial	11.5%	8.0%
Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.1%
Female	53.6%	48.2%
Male	46.4%	51.8%
Total students	349	7100

Average Attendance, discipline events, and academic achievement

	PASS ELP Only	District Comparison 9-12
	2014-15	2014-15
Attendance Rate	92.1%	92.6%
Discipline events	2.0	0.7
Aspire Composite 9th Grade	418	426
Aspire Composite 10th Grade	420	428

ACT Composite 11th Grade		16.2	21.3
Cumulative GPA		2.2	2.8

PASS ELP (2015-16)

Average Days of ELP 6-8

	2015-16
Days	46.2

Average Days of ELP 9-12

	2015-16
Days	48.4

Special Education status for ELP 6-8

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	18.2%	81.8%	16.1%	83.9%

Special Education status for ELP 9-12

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 9-12	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	29.7%	70.3%	17.0%	83.0%

ELL status for ELP 6-8

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	35.6%	64.4%	24.6%	75.4%

ELL status for ELP 9-12

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 9-12	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	22.8%	77.2%	23.3%	76.7%

Eligibility status for free and reduced meals for ELP 6-8

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 6-8	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	74.6%	25.4%	49.1%	50.9%

Eligibility status for free and reduced meals for ELP 9-12

	PASS ELP Only		District Comparison 9-12	
	% identified	% not identified	% identified	% not identified
2015-2016	79.2%	20.8%	42.9%	57.1%

Gender and race for ELP 6-8

	PASS ELP Only	District Comparison 6-8
	% in 2015-16	% in 2015-16
Hispanic/ Latino	27.7%	21.4%
White	22.2%	43.3%

African American	32.5%	18.2%
Asian	7.9%	8.2%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	0.6%	0.4%
Multiracial	9.1%	8.5%
Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.1%
Female	47.7%	47.6%
Male	52.3%	52.4%
Total students	658	5170

Gender and race for ELP 9-12

	PASS ELP Only	District Comparison 9-12
	% in 2015-16	% in 2015-16
Hispanic/ Latino	14.9%	17.5%
White	15.8%	46.7%
African American	56.4%	18.3%
Asian	2.0%	9.5%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	1.0%	0.3%
Multiracial	9.9%	7.7%
Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	0.0%	<0.1%
Female	39.6%	48.2%
Male	60.4%	51.8%
Total students	101	7192

Average Attendance, discipline events, and academic achievement for ELP 6-8

	PASS ELP Only	District Comparison 6-8
	2015-16	2015-16
Attendance Rate	95.2%	94.5%
Discipline events	4.9	3.9
MAP Mathematics 6th Grade Fall	204	212
MAP Mathematics 6th Grade Spring	211	216
MAP Mathematics 7th Grade Fall	211	217
MAP Mathematics 7th Grade Spring	216	220
MAP Mathematics 8th Grade Fall	214	221
MAP Mathematics 8th Grade Spring	218	224
MAP Reading 6th Grade Fall	209	217
MAP Reading 6th Grade Spring	217	224
MAP Reading 7th Grade Fall	219	224
MAP Reading 7th Grade Spring	226	230
MAP Reading 8th Grade Fall	222	230
MAP Reading 8th Grade Spring	227	234

Cumulative GPA	2.9	3.0

Average Attendance, discipline events, and academic achievement for ELP 9-12

	PASS ELP Only	District Comparison 9-12
	2015-16	2015-16
Attendance Rate	93.6%	92.4%
Discipline events	1.8	1.0
Aspire Composite 9th Grade	421	426
Aspire Composite 10th Grade	420	428
ACT Composite	15.5	21.2
Cumulative GPA	2.3	2.8

Comparative Analysis 6-8

Only ELP students with 30 or more days considered for the treatment group.

Comparative Impact on MAP *Mathematics* Score Growth

Year	Grade	Estimate (Std. Err.)
2016	Sixth	0.39 (1.12)
	Seventh	0.99 (1.59)
	Eighth	-2.13 (1.43)

Note: Bold indicates statistically significant findings with * at the 90% level (p=0.1) and ** at the 95% level (p=0.05)

Comparative Impact on MAP *Reading* Score Growth

Year	Grade	Estimate (Std. Err.)
2016	Sixth	-0.21 (1.23)
	Seventh	1.01 (1.40)
	Eighth	-0.27 (1.75)

Note: Bold indicates statistically significant findings with * at the 90% level (p=0.1) and ** at the 95% level (p=0.05)

Comparative Impact on Attendance Rate (Using a Linear Model)

Year	Grade	Estimate (Std. Err.)
2016	Sixth	**1.30 (0.70)***
	Seventh	**2.57 (1.41)***
	Eighth	**2.22 (1.02)****

Note: Bold indicates statistically significant findings with * at the 90% level (p=0.1) and ** at the 95% level (p=0.05)

Comparative Impact on Absence Days (Using a Linear Model)

Year	Grade	Estimate (Std. Err.)
2016	Sixth	**-2.41 (1.26)***
	Seventh	**-4.57 (2.51)***
	Eighth	**-3.92 (1.83)****

Note: Bold indicates statistically significant findings with * at the 90% level (p=0.1) and ** at the 95% level (p=0.05)

Comparative Impact on Proportion of Absence Days (Using a Negative Binomial Model)
Estimate is the ratio of absence days in treatment to absence days in control. For instance, in sixth grade, the model estimates 27% fewer absence days for the treatment group than the control group. The Marginal Effect converts this estimate to the impact on absence days given population averages.

Year	Grade	Estimate (Std. Err.)	Marginal Effect (in absence days)
2016	Sixth	**0.73 (0.10)****	**-2.6**
	Seventh	**0.69 (0.10)****	**-3.2**
	Eighth	**0.68 (0.14)***	**-2.9**

Note: Bold indicates statistically significant findings with * at the 90% level (p=0.1) and ** at the 95% level (p=0.05)

Appendix D: MMSD survey responses

2015 PASS (Staff survey)

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total Responses
The content of the tutoring sessions in this tutoring program are aligned to the curriculum and goals of the school.	34%	52%	7%	3%	3%	29
This tutoring program makes a positive impact on students' academic skills and knowledge.	41%	50%	0%	3%	6%	32
This tutoring program makes a positive impact on students' engagement with school.	39%	52%	6%	0%	3%	33
Tutors in this tutoring program are sufficiently prepared to address students' academic needs.	30%	40%	20%	7%	3%	30
Tutors in this tutoring program are sufficiently prepared to address students' social and emotional needs.	28%	31%	24%	10%	7%	29
Tutoring coordinators for this tutoring program are an active and positive part of the school community.	45%	39%	9%	6%	0%	33

2016 PASS (Staff survey)

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
This tutoring program is well-organized (e.g. communication with families and school staff, shows alignment to district priorities).	36%	43%	21%	0%	0%
This tutoring program uses quality tutoring strategies (e.g.1:3 or less tutor/student ratio, curriculum aligned to MMSD, etc).	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%
This tutoring program is relevant to the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of our students (e.g. volunteers reflect the diversity of the students; trains and supports staff and volunteers)	14%	86%	0%	0%	0%
This program works well with our school in coordinating its tutoring activitives (e.g. recruiting and supporting students, curriculum alignment, etc).	20%	73%	7%	0%	0%

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Tutors in this tutoring program are sufficiently trained for working with our students (e.g. program provides tutors with orientation and content specific training).	31%	54%	15%	0%	0%
This tutoring program seeks feedback to improve itself (e.g. program communicates regularly with school staff).	23%	54%	15%	8%	0%

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The tutoring program makes a positive impact on students' academic skills and knowledge.	36%	57%	7%	0%	0%
This tutoring program makes a positive impact on students' engagement with school (e.g. social-emotional or "non-cognitive" elements).	29%	71%	0%	0%	0%
This tutoring program helps students feel schoolwork is important.	14%	71%	14%	0%	0%
This tutoring program helps students to keep trying on schoolwork, even when it is hard.	21%	71%	7%	0%	0%
This tutoring program helps students be prepared for school (examples: finish assignments, go to class, organize supplies).	21%	57%	21%	0%	0%
This tutoring program helps students learn ways to do well in their classes (examples: set goals, how to study for a test).	15%	38%	46%	0%	0%
This tutoring program helps students make good decisions in school (examples: be responsible, cooperate with people, tell people what they need).	14%	64%	21%	0%	0%
This tutoring program helps students feel like they are an important part of the school.	15%	77%	8%	0%	0%

Needs PASS meets in schools
Participants responded that PASS provides "literacy tutoring", "Provides tutoring support for our reluctant readers and helps to build efficacy and belief in self. Builds relationships", and "Gives students engaging activities to participate in after school, builds relationships."

Partnership
Staff responded that the partnership between PASS and MMSD can be strengthened with additional tutors and more training for PASS tutors.
Other responses included:
- Have PASS Americorps partners attend periodic staff meetings to share their work and experiences.
- Clarification of role and training.

- We need more tutors, please! The tutor we have is AMAZING, but he cannot do it all alone.
- Again, seeking best times for tutoring (not missing new classroom instruction)

2016 PASS (Student survey)
N=112

Question	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No Answer
1. My tutor makes me feel schoolwork is important	49%	39%	11%	0%	0%	0%
2. I look forward to working with my tutor.	57%	28%	13%	3%	0%	0%
3. My tutor helps me to keep trying on schoolwork, even when it is hard.	58%	29%	13%	1%	0%	0%
4. I can read or write better because of my tutor.	50%	32%	12%	5%	1%	0%
5. My tutor helps me to be prepared for school (examples: finish assignments, go to class, organize my supplies).	46%	29%	20%	4%	2%	0%
6. My tutor cares about me as a person.	65%	23%	10%	1%	1%	0%
7. My tutor helps me learn ways to do well in my classes (examples: set goals, how to study for a test).	46%	38%	15%	1%	0%	0%
8. I am getting better grades in my reading/language arts classes because of my tutor.	45%	29%	17%	7%	1%	0%
9. My tutor helps me make good decisions in school (examples: be responsible, cooperate with people, tell people what I need).	52%	32%	12%	2%	0%	1%
10. My tutor has the skills and knowledge to help me in my schoolwork.	52%	39%	9%	0%	0%	0%
11. My tutor helps me feel like I am an important part of the school.	63%	25%	11%	1%	1%	0%

PARTNERS FOR AFTER SCHOOL SUCCESS
REVIEW OF RELEVANT RESEARCH

Summary of Literature

Literacy tutoring in school contexts:
An extensive research base suggests that overall, literacy tutoring has a significant, positive impact on student achievement as measured by test scores and stakeholder perception. Tutors do not need to be certified teachers, but the quality and frequency of training matter to the level of impact on student learning. One to one and small group instructional settings are best. With some mixed results on how to organize tutoring schedules, the greater the intensity of sessions (more per week), the greater the impact.

Extended and out of school time programming:
An extensive research base suggests that sustained participation in a variety of after-school activities (as opposed to solely homework help) has a positive impact on youth school performance and developmental outcomes. Programs that are structured to include purposeful instruction in social and emotional learning see gains in indicators such as positive social behaviors and self-confidence, and there is a demonstrated relationship between student learning in these areas and academic gains.

Measurement strategies for extended learning programs, including program impact on social-emotional growth and school engagement:
The body of peer-reviewed research on how to measure extended learning programs is small, but there are a multitude of existing guides and reviews of available instruments directed towards practitioners. The most comprehensive of these guides describe a list of possible performance measures and strategies for measuring both program effort and impact. These reviews include discussion of the two instruments currently used by PASS to evaluate engagement and social-emotional learning (SSES and DESSA).

Review of References by Topic

Topic 1: *Literacy tutoring in school contexts*

Citation	Methodology	Findings
Allen, A. & N. Chavkin (2004). New evidence that tutoring with community volunteers can help middle school students improve their academic achievement. *The School Community Journal 14* (2).	Within program control group, comparing 13 to 60 hours of participation over the course of a school year. Middle school AmeriCorps tutoring program targeting students at risk of dropping out	A significant increase in the number of students who improved their grades compared to the grade they had before tutoring began. There were no significant differences in subject areas or grade levels.
Burns, M, Senesac, B. & B. Silberglitt. (2008). Longitudinal effect of a volunteer tutoring program on reading skills of students identified as at-risk for reading failure: A two-year follow-up study. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 47*, 27-37.	Quantitative comparison of treatment (HOSTS) to control groups, longitudinal over two school years. HOSTS (Help One Student To Succeed) one to one volunteer reading tutoring program with low-achieving elementary students.	-Curriculum is structured but customized and aligned with classroom, tutors are varied community members, tutors get two hours of training, students get 30 minute sessions four days/week, sometimes with different tutors -HOSTS students outperformed control groups in reading fluency (0.51), reading progress and comprehension (0.28)
Denton, C., Anthony, J., Parker, R., & J. Hasbrouck. (2004). Effects of two tutoring programs on the English Reading Development of Spanish-English bilingual students. *The Elementary School Journal, 104* (4), 289-305.	Experimental design, Comparison of gains on diagnostic assessment between two treatment groups and control. Two, different reading interventions (Read Well; Read Naturally) for Spanish-dominant, bilingual students, grades 2-5; used trained undergrad tutors	-Students made positive gains in decoding through Read Well (phonics based) but not comprehension -Students did not make progress on either decoding or comprehension with the Read Naturally (repeated reading, discussion)

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M & S. Moody. (2000). How effective are one to one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(4), 605-619.	Meta-analysis, only including quantitative studies comparing intervention with control groups. One to one tutoring for elementary students at risk of failure in reading; 29 studies of 42 samples of students between 1975 and 1998.	-One to one tutoring had an overall statistically significant effect on reading outcomes (0.41) -Variations in effect sizes were significantly associated with tutor qualifications, with the greatest gains coming in students tutored by college students. Other important tutor-level factors were whether they were trained and whether they came to each session and tutored for the full session time (consistent tutors); 0.85 to .06. -A number of the studies showed no difference in effect between one to one and small group tutoring -The mean total instructional time for programs lasting up to 20 weeks was 63 hours, while the mean for programs lasting more than 20 weeks was 61 hours. Greater effects were found with the former - programs that had greater intensity of sessions over a shorter amount of weeks.
Gattis et al. (2010). Examining the effects of New York Experience Corps program on young readers. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 49,* 299-314.	Quantitative, randomized pre-test/post-test. New York City Experience Corps, a volunteer tutoring program using older volunteers (majority over 65) with elementary students to improve reading through use of "Book Buddies" program; tutors receive 2 weeks of training and funds to offset costs of participation; has used AmeriCorps staff in the past to coordinate volunteers	-Students made considerable gains over control groups in the PALS (Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening) test, but not ECLAS (Early Childhood Literacy Assessment System) -Suggest benefits of engaging older volunteers in reading tutoring
Gordon, E. (2009). Five ways to improve tutoring: Evidence on tutoring points to practices that are found in the most successful tutoring programs. *Phi Delta Kappan 90* (6). Available: http://www.pdkmembers.org/members_online/publications/Archive/pdf/k0902gor.pdf	Review of research on tutoring to identify a summary of recommendations for school-based tutoring programs. The literature cited is a bit dated and note this is *not* peer-reviewed.	Recommendations include: 1. Use a diagnostic/developmental tutoring program (examples of diagnostic tools given) 2. Structure the tutoring program 3. Use experienced teachers as tutors and train them 4. Site of tutoring can maximize long-term results (authors found in-home to be the most effective, but only based on one study) 5. Encourage the use of peer-tutoring

Jung, E., Molfese, V. & A. Larson. (2011). More than Good Intentioned Help: Volunteer Tutoring and Elementary Readers. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 19* (3), 277-299.	The study involved two elementary schools and 30 students who were participating in the community based tutoring program and who were randomly assigned to reading-only or reading/writing tutoring conditions.	-In this study, researchers examined whether tutoring implemented by **volunteer tutors** impacted struggling elementary readers' reading skills, their attitudes toward reading, and their self-confidence. --Findings suggested that students could improve their reading fluencies if they had the support of trained adult **tutors**, even just once each week for 30 to 40 minutes for a semester. Female students improved in their reading fluency measure more so than did male students, but such improvement was not notable in other areas, including attitudes toward reading or self-confidence.
Moore-Hart, M & S. Karabenick. (2009). Becoming successful readers: A volunteer tutoring program for culturally diverse students. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 48*, 149-171.	Mixed method, including gains on multiple academic measures, teacher and parent surveys and interviews, student and tutor interviews. Elementary students recommend by teachers because of low reading ability; tutors were AmeriCorps volunteers varied in age but all attending a nearby college	-Tutors attended weekly 90 minute training sessions; tutoring sessions were twice a week; tutoring materials and tutor manual put together to respond to multicultural student population -In general, one to one tutoring on reading, practicing word recognition, writing and word-building strategies promoted reading performance -Students tutored twice a week gained .92 grade equivalents while those tutored four times a week gained 2.74 grade equivalents. -Students (even those who showed gains in reading performance) did not perceive improvement in reading, although teachers generally perceived an improvement in students reading ability and well as student confidence in reading -Parents reported benefits to their children's reading abilities and confidence, as did tutors
Morris, D. (2006). Using non-certified tutors to work with at-risk readers: An evidence-based model. *The Elementary School Journal, 106* (4), 351-362.	Synthesis/review of five different quantitative studies of tutoring programs with similar structures. Non-certified tutors working with elementary school students at risk for reading failure.	-45 minutes sessions were twice a week and were supervised by a knowledgeable reading teacher; materials were customized but structured including basal readers and a word study program -Community volunteers and teaching-aides can be effective with struggling readers as long as there is sufficient training -Specifically, average effect sizes were .72 for word recognition, .84 for passage reading, and .71 for comprehension -The quality of supervision over tutors was key to success
Ritter, G, Barnett, J., Denny, G. & G. Albin. (2009). The effectiveness of volunteer tutoring programs for elementary and	Meta-analysis, using only randomized field trials. 28 different studies from 1985 or later of students in K-8 volunteer	-Volunteer tutoring programs had an overall statistically significant effect on the composite of reading outcomes (0.30). -There is *not* a significant difference in effect by degree of program structure (e.g. tutors have specific materials to cover), tutor type (e.g. parent, college-

middle school students: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(1)*,* 3-38.	(adult, non-professional) tutoring programs	age, community member, etc.) -Program time and duration for the 28 studies ranged from one to five times a week; 15 to 60 minutes per session and four weeks to two years.

Topic 2: *Extended and out of school time programming*

Citation	Methodology	Findings
Cosden, M., Morrison, G., Gutierrez, L. & M. Brown. (2010). The effects of homework programs and after-school activities on school success. *Theory into Practice 43*(4).	Summary of research on the impact of after-school activities—including homework programs—on school performance.	Participation and youth investment in a variety of after-school activities (as opposed to solely homework help) have positive impacts on school performance and developmental outcomes.
Durlak, J., Weissberg, R. & M. Pachen. (2010) Meta-analysis of after-school programs that promote social skills in adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 45:294–309.	Meta-analysis of 75 after-school program studies with middle/high school, mixed income (25% low income), mostly youth of color.	Youth who participate significantly improve self-confidence (+.37), school bonding (+.25), positive social behaviors (+.29), school grades (+.22) and achievement test scores (all significant at .05 level) compared to controls. Programs using evidence-based skill training (SAFE) produced greater benefits for youth over programs that did not use such approaches.
Durlak et al. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social & emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development 82*(1):405-32.	Meta-analysis of 213 SEL program studies	Compared to controls, SEL participants demonstrated significantly improved social and emotional skills, attitudes, behavior, and academic performance that reflected an 11-percentile-point gain in achievement. Participants in programs meeting SAFE model criteria demonstrate significant improvement in skills (+.69), school attitudes (+.24), school behavior (+.28), and academic performance (+.28) reflected compared to controls. 34% secondary school; mix of low income and race; rural and urban settings.
Edwards, D., Hunt, M., Meyers, J., Grogg, K. & O. Jarrett. (2005). Acceptability and student outcomes of a violence prevention curriculum. *Journal of Primary Prevention 26*(5).	Mixed method evaluation of impact of the Second Step curriculum with 4th and 5th grade students.	Significant positive changes were also found for Behavior Assessment System for Children items reflecting student use of problem solving as well as report card items indicating respectful and cooperative behavior. Qualitative data from interviews with students provided in depth information about treatment acceptability and types of behavioral changes observed. Student interviews support the conclusion that the quantitative pre-post changes were directly connected to key components of the violence

		prevention curriculum.
Feldman, A. & J. Matjasko. (2005). The Role of school-based extracurricular activities in adolescent development: A comprehensive review and future directions. *Review of Educational Research 75*: 159-210	Review of existing research	The associations between school-based extra-curricular activity participation and patterns of participation, academic achievement, substance use, sexual activity, psychological adjustment, delinquency, and young adult outcomes are mostly positive.
Good, A., Burch, P., Stewart, M., Acosta, R., & Heinrich, C. (2014). Instruction Matters: Lessons From a Mixed-Method Evaluation of Out-of-School Time Tutoring Under No Child Left Behind. *Teachers College Record*, *116*(3).	Mixed method, longitudinal study of afterschool tutoring in five urban districts. Included qualitative interviews, focus groups and observations, as well as quantitative analysis of program impact on academic achievement	The minimum threshold for students to start to see academic gains from afterschool tutoring programs is 40 hours over the course of a school year. Tutoring programs tended to not include innovative instructional methods, nor close alignment to students' day school instruction. Tutors must have access to information about students' special learning needs
Harvard Family Research Project (2008) "After School in the 21st Century". Available: http://www.hfrp.org/var/hfrp/storage/fckeditor/File/file/OSTissuebrief10_summary.pdf	Experimental, quasi and meta-analysis studies on the positive impact of after school programs on student academics. Note this review is not peer-reviewed, but the research cited is.	Sustained participation in quality afterschool programming contributes to positive academic, social and emotional outcomes.
INCRE & NIOST. (2005). *Pathways to success for youth. What counts in after-school.* Available: http://www.wcwonline.org/proj/mars/MARSfinalexec.pdf	Interviews with program directors, youth surveys of middle school participants, observations, and afterschool staff surveys (SAYO). Not peer reviewed.	Program quality indicators: staff engagement with youth; youth engagement; high quality, challenging activities; quality homework time; family relationships at pick-up time; appropriate space.

Kahne, J. et al. (2001). Assessing after-school programs as contexts for youth development. *Youth and Society 32* (4).	Survey data for students in grades 6-10 involved in a variety of after school activities.	*"Only some after-school programs provide more opportunities and supports for youth development than students receive during the school day but that almost all provide significantly more attractive affective contexts than students experience during the school day."*
Lauer, P. et al. (2006). Out-of-school time (OST): A Meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research, 76*, 275–313.	35 OST studies using control or comparison groups	At-risk students who participate in OST programs significantly improve learning outcomes, including reading achievement, compared to at-risk students who do not participate ($p<.05$). OST programs with both academic and social activities have a positive influence on student achievement.
Peck, S., Roeser, R., Zarrett, N. & J. Eccles. (2008). Exploring the roles of extracurricular activity and quality in the educational resilience of vulnerable adolescents: Variable- and pattern-centered approaches. *Journal of Social Issues 64*(1), p135-156.	Longitudinal study of the impact of the pattern and amount of extra-curricular activities on educational persistence (college enrollment).	*Positive extracurricular activity settings afford vulnerable youth developmentally appropriate experiences that promote educational persistence and healthy development.*
Penuel, W., & R. McGhee. (2010). *21st Century Community Learning Centers: Descriptive Study of Program Practices.* Washington, DC: OPEPD.	Survey, interview and observation of a sample of 21st CCLCs. Not peer-reviewed.	Mostly descriptive regarding staffing, policies and staff reporting of attendance rates, etc. Primary challenges for CLCs: (a) staff departures after graduating from school or completing a program of study, as the lack of benefits makes it difficult to retain high-quality staff; (b) a lack of up-to-date information about students' individual needs and (c) low attendance rates, the remedy for which requires more than simply having attendance policies
Scales, P. & D. Fisher (2003). *Tips for building the developmental assets most linked to common positive youth development program outcomes.* Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute. Available: http://www.search-institute.org/sites/default/files/a/PrevPrograms.pdf	Review of Search Institute research on connection between specific youth assets and particular youth program outcomes. References previous Search Institute (Scales, P. C., & Roehlkepartain, E. C. (2003) report on the statistically significant association ($p<.o5$) between 40-developmental assets	Well-organized and accessible tables for each of the four youth program outcomes identified ("promoting school success, preventing violence/bullying/aggression, preventing alcohol, tobacco and drug use, preventing teen pregnancy"). For example: *Outcome* = promoting school success *Asset categories* = support caring school environment, high expectations, etc *Strategies* = youth-led mentoring, show assets between assets and diverse cultures, etc.

	and indicators of academic achievement for middle and high school youth across gender and grade. Not peer-reviewed.	

Topic 3: *Measurement strategies for extended learning programs, including program impact on social-emotional growth and school engagement*

Citation	Methodology	Findings
Boufford, S. & P. Little. (2004). Detangling data collection: Methods for gathering data. *Out of School Time Evaluation Snapshots, 5.* Available: http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/publications-series/out-of-school-time-evaluation-snapshots/detangling-data-collection-methods-for-gathering-data	Brief summary of the common data collection methods used by current out-of-school time programs to evaluate their implementation and outcomes. Not peer-reviewed.	The review provides structured information about using surveys and questionnaires, interviews and focus groups, observations, tests and assessments, and secondary sources and data reviews. For each type, the following is discussed: purpose, type of information collection, advantages, challenges and additional information. Examples given for each type.
Fredricks, J., McColskey, W., Meli, J., Mordica, J., Montrosse, B., & Mooney, K. (2011). *Measuring student engagement in upper elementary through high school: A description of 21 instruments.* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2011–No. 098). Washington, DC: U.S. DOE. Available: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.	The report describes the results of a literature review to identify available instruments. The 21 instruments identified include the SSES and are described according to what is measured, their purpose and use, and the technical information available on their psychometric properties. Not peer-reviewed.	This report is very detailed in its descriptions of what instruments measure, it's purpose, etc. The report does not make specific recommendations on the "best" of these instruments, but instead provides information on the best fit and available information on validity and reliability. A detailed description and review of the School Student Engagement Survey is found on page 48 of the report, including its primary focus on evaluating truancy prevention efforts.
Haggerty, K., Elgin, J. & A. Woolley. (2011). Social - emotional learning assessment measures for middle school youth.	Uses social-emotional competencies established by CASEL as a framework to review 73 tools for assessing social-	Review used a set of criteria including: intended population is middle school students, it monitors change over time, is scientifically sound, and is practical to administer. A detailed and specific review is provided for each instrument, including the DESSA (used with Second Step curriculum) and

Seattle, WA: SDRG-University of Washington. Available: http://raikesfoundation.org/Documents/SELTools.pdf	emotional learning, 10 of which met the criteria and were summarized. Not peer-reviewed.	DESSA Mini, which starts on page 28. DESSA receives a favorable review for validity and reliability.
Little, P., DuPree, S., & S. Deich. (2002). Documenting progress and demonstrating results: Evaluating local out-of-school time programs. *Issues and Opportunities in Evaluating Out of School Time*, *3.* Available: http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/documenting-progress-and-demonstrating-results-evaluating-local-out-of-school-time-programs	A comprehensive guide for how and why OST programs should conduct evaluations. Not peer-reviewed.	Evaluations should be conducted for a combination of three reasons: make management decisions, demonstrate accountability, and make the case for sustainability. Part I of the guide reviews the key issues of conducting program evaluation, Part II describes how a logic model can be a useful tool for program planning and evaluation, Part III describes the five-tiered approach to program evaluation (summarized on p26) and its applicability to OST evaluation, and Part IV provides practical suggestions on how to maximize the power and utility of evaluation results. This guide is extremely detailed and fairly easy to navigate when looking for specific topics.
Little, P., Harris, E., & S. Boufford. (2004). Performance indicators in out-of-school time evaluation. *Out of School Time Evaluation Snapshots, 3.* Available: http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/publications-series/out-of-school-time-evaluation-snapshots/performance-measures-in-out-of-school-time-evaluation	Summary of available list of the academic, youth development, and prevention performance measures currently being used by out-of-school time programs to assess their progress. It also includes the corresponding data sources for these measures.	Identifies two types of performance measures: effort and effects. For each category of performance measure (academic, youth development, and prevention) a detailed list of possible performance measures and corresponding data sources are included. Report includes a short discussion on how to choose appropriate performance measures: -Range of measures should reflect diversity in the program -Performance measures are not the same as performance indicators -Consider availability of data sources -Performance measures should yield information that is helpful to program improvement
Peter, N. (2002). *Outcomes and research in out of school time program design*. Out of School Time Resource Center – University of Pennsylvania. Available: http://www.sp2.upenn.edu/ostrc/doclibrary/documents/OutcomesandResearchinOut-of-	Discussion of best practice research and recommendations from leading OST organizations. The review is very well organized and accessible. Note this review is not peer-reviewed, but much of the research cited is.	Sequenced discussion of common outcomes identified in OST programs ("increased academic achievement, decreased involvement in risky behavior, increased access to employment, enhanced life skills"). Summary of frameworks and program standards for successful OST programs as identified by leading OST resource centers. Starting on page 9, each common outcome of OST is listed with corresponding sample indicators, best practices and sample documentation. OF particular interest for evaluation are the lists of sample indicators associated with each outcome. For example:

SchoolTimeProgramDesign.pdf		*Outcome*: Increased Academic Achievement
		Sample Indicators: Improved grades; better test scores; improved school attendance; reduced drop-out rates; increased high school graduation, increased college attendance and graduation
		Best Practices: Academic achievement programs; constructive learning activities; cultural activities; community-based youth development programs; consistent adult guidance and support; service-learning; mentoring; tutoring; asset-based programming; project-based learning; formal after-school programs; extracurricular activities
		Sample Documentation:
		-"In Memphis, Tenn., students who participated on a regular basis in an after-school program with group tutoring and a language arts curriculum showed higher academic achievement than their peers according to state assessment." (Safe and Smart)
		-"Schools that sponsor service-learning programs reported that attendance increased every year over a three-year period." (Learning In Deed).
Scott-Little, C., Hamann, M., & S. Jurs. (2002). American Journal of Evaluation 23 (4) 387-419	Review of after-school evaluations in a meta-evaluation of evaluation methodologies. Synthesized findings of the evaluations.	After-school evaluation reports located for the study demonstrated moderate compliance with *The Program Evaluation Standards* established by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation but there is a limited use of research designs that support causal conclusions and insufficient information to allow for meta-analysis of program effects. Essentially this review concludes it is difficult to evaluate OST programs in a way that leads to causal inferences.
Weiss, H. (2004). Understanding & measuring attendance in out of school time. *Issues and Opportunities in Evaluating Out of School Time, 7*. Available: http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/publications-series/issues-and-opportunities-in-out-of-school-time-evaluation/understanding-and-measuring-attendance-in-out-of-school-time-programs	Discussion of how to measure attendance in OST programs through review of 27 OST experimental and matched design studies of middle/elementary programs with mixed student populations based on poverty status and race. Review is not peer-reviewed, but the literature cited is.	Attendance indicators include intensity (amount of time youth attend a program during a given period), duration (summarizes the history of attendance) and breadth (variety of activities that youth attend within and across programs). The review highlights the importance of looking at participation and attendance in nuanced ways (e.g. difference between attending at al and coming everyday all year). Review found significant associations between OST attendance and social, behavioral and school engagement outcomes including spending more time on homework and having a sense of belonging to school.
Wimer, C., Boufford, S., Little, P., & C. Goss. (2008).	Exhaustive collection and summary of existing tools for	Recommendations are not made, but instead instruments are organized by category: Academics, Psychological/Social Development, Alcohol, Tobacco,

Measurement tools for evaluating out-of-school time programs: An evaluation resource. *Out of School Time Evaluation Snapshots, 6.* Available: http://www.hfrp.org/out-of-school-time/publications-resources/measurement-tools-for-evaluating-out-of-school-time-programs-an-evaluation-resource	measuring various aspects of OST programming. Not peer-reviewed.	and Other Drug Use Prevention, Program Quality/Program Environment, Multicomponent Scales/Comprehensive Surveys. Some of the instruments listed have their own validation studies, for example: Tracy, A., Surr, W., & Richer, A. (2012). *The Assessment of Afterschool Program Practices Tool (APT): Findings from the APT Validation Study*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time. Available: http://www.wcwonline.org/images/stories/virtuemart/product/apt_report_v3_final_6-30-20123.pdf

Review Methods

Literature from peer-reviewed, scholarly journals was considered, along with reports from research institutions that were reviewed for validity. Publications are peer-reviewed unless otherwise noted. Only articles reporting on studies of math, reading, or language arts were considered and study populations had to include students in grades five or higher and only in the United States. Only studies on programs using adult tutors (age 18 or older, did not include any literature on peer tutors) were considered and the search was limited to studies or meta-analyses published from 2000-present. Review was completed in November of 2014.